

**UNPUBLISHED**

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS  
FOR THE FOURTH CIRCUIT

---

**No. 14-7019**

---

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

Plaintiff - Appellee,

v.

LOUIS ANTONIO BRYANT, a/k/a Tinio, a/k/a Black, a/k/a B  
Stacks,

Defendant - Appellant.

---

Appeal from the United States District Court for the Western  
District of Virginia, at Charlottesville. Norman K. Moon,  
Senior District Judge. (3:04-cr-00047-NKM-RSB-1; 3:14-cv-80748-  
NKM-RSB)

---

Submitted: October 16, 2014

Decided: October 22, 2014

---

Before MOTZ, WYNN, and THACKER, Circuit Judges.

---

Dismissed by unpublished per curiam opinion.

---

Louis Antonio Bryant, Appellant Pro Se. Ronald Mitchell Huber,  
Assistant United States Attorney, Charlottesville, Virginia, for  
Appellee.

---

Unpublished opinions are not binding precedent in this circuit.

PER CURIAM:

Louis Antonio Bryant seeks to appeal the district court's order treating his motion to be resentenced as a successive 28 U.S.C. § 2255 (2012) motion, and dismissing it on that basis. The order is not appealable unless a circuit justice or judge issues a certificate of appealability. 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(1)(B) (2012). A certificate of appealability will not issue absent "a substantial showing of the denial of a constitutional right." 28 U.S.C. § 2253(c)(2) (2012). When the district court denies relief on the merits, a prisoner satisfies this standard by demonstrating that reasonable jurists would find that the district court's assessment of the constitutional claims is debatable or wrong. Slack v. McDaniel, 529 U.S. 473, 484 (2000); see Miller-El v. Cockrell, 537 U.S. 322, 336-38 (2003). When the district court denies relief on procedural grounds, the prisoner must demonstrate both that the dispositive procedural ruling is debatable, and that the motion states a debatable claim of the denial of a constitutional right. Slack, 529 U.S. at 484-85. We have independently reviewed the record and conclude that Bryant has not made the requisite showing.

Accordingly, we deny a certificate of appealability and dismiss the appeal. We dispense with oral argument because the facts and legal contentions are adequately presented in the

materials before this court and argument would not aid the decisional process.

DISMISSED